



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,831	02/23/2004	Akcimi Hirotune	501.40492CX1	5431
20457	7590	11/14/2005	EXAMINER	
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP			DINH, TAN X	
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1800				
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873			2653	

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/782,831	HIROTSUNE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TAN X. DINH	2653	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/929,127.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/23/04</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

Art Unit: 2653

- 1) The preliminary amendment filed 2/23/2004 is acknowledged.
- 2) This application is a Continuation Application of S/N 09/929,127, filed 8/15/2001 and now is US 6,788,642; which is related to Co-pending Application of S/N 10/782,832, filed on 2/23/2004; which has foreign priority claimed to foreign application filed in JAPAN as:
 - JAPAN 2001-107928, filed on 4/06/2001.
 - JAPAN 2001-120469, filed on 4/19/2001.

3) The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The co-pending US application (S/N 10/782,832, filed on 2/23/2004) on section of CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS in the specification need to be updated.

Appropriate correction is required.

4) The I.D.S filed 2/23/2004 has been considered by the Examiner. However, the Japan and/or foreign document(s), if they have not been written in English, are considered to the extent that could be understood from the English Abstract and the drawings.

Form PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 is(are) attached herein.

Art Unit: 2653

5) The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed Terminal Disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 2653

6) Claims 1-20 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,788,642. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because:

The claims invention in this instant application and the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,788,642 recite the same features with each other, except that one recites the medium having unrecordable restrict blocks and the other recites the medium having unreadable restrict blocks. However, this different is not a patentable weight since the restrict blocks in medium can be set to be unrecordable restrict blocks or unreadable restrict blocks depending on purposes of the user. Further, since the body of these claims recite the same structures and/or functions with each other and this would not make them a patentable distinction.

7) Claims 1-20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 10/782,832. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because:

Art Unit: 2653

The claims invention in this instant application and the claims of copending Application No. 10/782,832 recite the same features with each other, except that one recites the medium having unreadable restrict blocks and the other recites the medium having unaccessible restrict blocks. However, this different is not a patentable weight since unreadable restrict blocks and unaccessible restrict blocks having the same meaning with each other and since the body of these claims recite the same structures and/or functions with each other and this would not make them a patentable distinction.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

8) The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

(See form PTO-892 attached herein).

9) Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TAN XUAN DINH whose telephone number is (571)272-7586. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-FRIDAY from 8:00AM to 5:00PM.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2653

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see [http://pair-direct.uspto.gov./](http://pair-direct.uspto.gov/) Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) .



TAN DINH
PRIMARY EXAMINER
November 10, 2005